

9/9/03 - 2644

**Capito, Bonnie P. (EFDLANT)**

---

**From:** Jackson, Rodger W. (EFDLANT)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 24, 2003 11:59 AM  
**To:** Capito, Bonnie P. (EFDLANT)  
**Subject:** FW: Site 85 Decision Document

ar

Rodger W. Jackson, P.E.  
Environmental Engineer  
Naval Facilities Engineering Command  
Atlantic Division, Code EV23  
6506 Hampton Blvd  
Norfolk VA 23508-1278  
Tel: (757) 322-4589 Fax: (757) 322-4805  
Email: jacksonrw@efdlant.navfac.navy.mil  
Web Page: <http://lantdiv.navfac.navy.mil>

-----Original Message-----

From: Townsend.Gena@epamail.epa.gov  
[mailto:Townsend.Gena@epamail.epa.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2003 11:30 AM  
To: Doug.Bitterman@ch2m.com  
Cc: christopherjk@cherrypoint.usmc.mil; GeorgeL100@aol.com;  
george.lane@ncmail.net; JacksonRW@efdlant.navfac.navy.mil;  
Thornton.Michelle@epamail.epa.gov; Stancin.Martin@ch2m.com  
Subject: RE: Site 85 Decision Document

Hi all,

I have reviewed the signature page and have one question.

The first conclusion states: "iron, lead and manganese exceeded twice the average Cherry Point background". The next sentence states: "although iron and manganese exceeded twice the average background they are well within the range of background concentrations at Cherry Point". I am confused by what is meant by this statement. Are you saying, if the concentrations are not average and multiplied by 2 then they will fall within an acceptable range? If this is the case, why identify the "twice average background number"? Also, it appears that there are two background numbers in use. Please help me understand this statement.

Gena D. Townsend  
US EPA  
61 Forsyth Street, SW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
Tel. No: (404) 562-8538  
Townsend.Gena@epa.gov